



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/590,905	06/09/2000	Jens Herman Jensen	NI 127	1599

7590

03/04/2002

Klaus J. Bach
4407 Twin Oaks Drive
Murrysville, PA 15668

EXAMINER

BRATLIE, STEVEN A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3652

DATE MAILED: 03/04/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

590905

Applicant(s)

JENSEN

Examiner

BRATLIE

Group Art Unit

3652

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on amendment filed 12/22/01.
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 1 1; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3, 4, 6-24 is/are pending in the application.
- ☐ Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3, 4, 6-24 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☒ The ~~proposed~~ drawing ~~correction~~, filed on 12/22/01 is ☒ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
 - ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number)
 - ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 1 7.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received:

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s).
- ☒ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Other

Office Action Summary

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3, 4, 6-24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

2. With respect to the 35 USC 112 first paragraph rejection, it is common knowledge that reference numerals refer to a single element. It should be self evident that Fig. 4 has no elements #13, #14, #35.

3. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because should be presented as a clean copy. Correction is required. See MPEP §608.01(b).

4. 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, requires the specification to be written in "full, clear, concise, and exact terms." The specification is replete with terms which are not clear, concise and exact. The specification should be revised carefully in order to comply with 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Examples of some unclear, inexact or verbose terms used in the specification are: "slide elements 32, 33", "guide elements 30, 31" "guide elements 32, 33", "the two support..., see figs. 4, ...traverse beam 35.", number list should be cancelled.

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

Art Unit: 3652

2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

7. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fretwell #5,556,250 in view of EP 786374 and Japanese Patent #10109585. Fretwell #5,556,250 discloses a loading platform that retracts under a truck. Fretwell's unit is mounted to the vehicle frame by cross members #144, col. 6, lines 10-17. Fretwell's unit is not adjustably mounted to the frame. EP 786374 discloses longitudinal adjustment to the frame "F", while Japanese Patent #101⁰9585 discloses in Fig. 2 the use of a bolt and lower slot #35 type of adjustment. It would have been obvious to a mechanic with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide this adjustment feature to Fretwell. The motivation is to adapt the unit to various vehicles.

8. Claims 8-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fretwell #5,556,250 in view of EP 786374, Japanese Patent #10109585 as applied above, and further in view of Mortensen and Disque.

Fretwell et al lacks the specific loading platform with transverse beam between lifting supports. Mortensen discloses a loading platform with transverse beam #44 between lifting supports. It would have been obvious to a mechanic with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute such a platform. The motivation is to load general material. Disque discloses the use of C-shaped channels and end stops #42, #43, see col. 3, line 27+.

Art Unit: 3652

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven Bratlie whose telephone number is 703-308-2669. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays through Thursday from 6:30 to 5:00. Friday is the examiner's day off.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-306-

4177
4143.

Bratlie/cw
February 26, 2002

Steven A. Bratlie

**STEVEN A. BRATLIE
PRIMARY EXAMINER**